DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 437 RC 023 755

AUTHOR	Farrell, Joseph P.; Mfum-Mensah, Obed
TITLE	A Preliminary Analytical Framework for Comparative Analysis of Alternative Primary Education Programs in Developing Nations.
PUB DATE	2002-03-00
NOTE	34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (46th, Orlando, FL, March 6-9, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Active Learning; Administrator Role; Comparative Education; *Developing Nations; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Change; Educational Practices; *Elementary Education; Foreign Countries; *Nontraditional Education; *Research Needs; Rural Education; School Community Relationship; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Learner Centered Instruction; *Marginalized Groups

ABSTRACT

There has been a quiet revolution growing in schooling in many parts of the developing world, particularly at the primary level. These mostly successful radical alternatives are little known among educators and scholars of education. In many cases, children who are considered the hardest to reach and teach accomplish curricular objectives not achieved in traditional formal schools. These programs also demonstrate that, contrary to popular belief, teachers are not obstacles to change but are the change agents. These teachers manage to develop or change their practice so fundamentally that they produce large learning gains among children thought to be unteachable. These successful change programs typically spread not by a centrally planned and mandated reform plan but by teachers learning from other teachers and sharing their personal practical knowledge and skills with each other. Administrative leadership often plays a critical role in these programs, but it differs from the traditional model in that it enables teacher learning and teacher-driven change, rather than controlling and regulating teaching. The question that arises is, how have these successes actually occurred in each case, given the history of failed attempts at large-scale educational reform? Four figures are presented as a preliminary effort to develop a useful set of categories for comparative analysis of these cases. It is hoped that they will be used to design a long-term research program that will enable us to avoid repeating past failures. (Contains 30 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 470 437

A PRELIMINARY ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

DR. JOSEPH P. FARRELL

OBED MFUM-MENSAH

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION/UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

March, 2002

Draft: Do not quote or cite without permission of the authors.

Email: jfarrell@oise.utoronto.ca
omfum-mensah@oise.utoronto.ca

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph P. Farrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

023755

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Preliminary Analytic Framework for Comparative Analysis of Alternative Primary Education Programs in Developing Nations

J. P. Farrell
O. Mfum-Mensah

This paper, and this panel, represent a continuation and geographical.and intellectual expansion of what we (Farrell, 2001; Miwa, 2001, O'Sullivan, 2001; Pitt, 2001) presented a year ago at CIES 2001. As we noted then, starting over 20 years ago, and gaining momentum over the past decade, there has been a quiet revolution in schooling in many parts of the "developing" world, which is in many cases radically transforming the "forms" of formal schooling as we have come to know them, particularly at the primary level. These mostly successful radical alternatives are little known among educators and scholars of education in "developed" nations, and frequently little known, if at all, and/or poorly understood, in their "home" nations or regions. A small published literature about them is beginning to grow, but it consists mainly of relatively brief individual case studies with few references to other "cases" and very recently some comparative analyses of relatively small sets of cases from the same geo-cultural region. (Farrell, 1999a,1999b; Reimers, 2000; Anderson, 2002). But it is still mostly scanty, fugitive and hard to find. Over the past few years a team of about 20 OISE/UT graduate students and a growing network of local and international faculty and program developers/administrators have been working to: 1) systematically gather information about these alternative models or programs (Last year we reported that we had just over 100 cases in our "database"–which in this case is a fancy title for some file drawers filled with printed material–we now have about 120 cases.); 2) add to that literature through a series of targeted thesis research projects; and 3) begin a broad comparative

analysis of them. Last year we presented analyses of three cases from Latin America: *Escuela Nueva* in Colombia, P-900 in Chile, and ESEDIR in Guatemala, plus an early-version overview of the entire set. This year we present three cases which expand the geographic range: the Non-formal Primary Education Program of the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) (Haiplik, 2002); the Shepherd School program in northern Ghana (Mfum-Mensah, 2002); and teachers and their communities in very remote villages in Tajikistan (Niyozov, 2002). These three cases represent programs or projects of very different size and "stage" of development of these alternative forms. The BRAC program is one of the largest and "oldest" of the programs. The Shepherd School program is relatively new and still small-scale. The Tajikistan paper refers to schools which are truly "community schools" within a very traditional system and to the struggles of economically extremely poor teachers to dream and construct alternatives within extraordinarily harsh and difficult conditions. Thus we see in these three cases a set of illustrations of the potential "stages of development" of such programs; from early dreams and aspirations and struggles, through early stage "piloting" and implementation, to development of a system involving tens of thousands of schools and hundred of thousands of learners.

This overview paper represents an extension of last year's comparative analysis work. In the time since then we have been working at developing a set of analytic categories/dimensions along which we can classify/locate these programs, and identify their similarities and differences, as a basis for serious detailed comparative analysis. There are two main objectives of this analytical exercise. One is to simply map out what is currently uncharted terrain; to develop a useful set of categories as a framework for comparative analysis of these cases. The other is to try to use that

framework as a way to target and design a long-term program of research on individual cases which would allow each individual research exercise to contribute maximally to the overall knowledge development exercise. We return to the cartographic metaphor. When confronting almost wholly uncharted terrain what one first needs is something like the Lewis and Clark expedition in the early years of the United States of America or the explorations of John Franklin and Simon Fraser in the far north and west of what later became Canada–one needs to map out the major landforms, rivers, hill and mountain systems and get at least a first approximation of the different peoples who inhabit them. From that exercise one can identify places and themes where more detailed explorations, more detailed topographical and other forms of mapping, can be most potentially productive. Over time the two kinds of exercises will necessarily feed into each other. One of the things that we have discovered is that this classification/category development exercise is far more complicated and difficult than we had initially imagined. At this early stage the exercise is raising far more questions than it is answering. That is to be expected at this early stage.

As a starting point we present the characterizations of "traditional" and "alternative" schools found in the previous paper. (Farrell, 2001). See Figures 1 and 2. It should be clearly noted that these two contrasting lists of characteristics are of different orders of "truth value." The first list, the "forms of formal schooling," rests upon a huge volume of research and descriptive reporting. We can quite safely claim that almost all formal schools throughout the world exemplify all or almost all of the characteristics on that list, or vary from them only in small degree. Amongst the millions of traditional standard schools in the world there are of course exceptions, but they are

small in number and generally modest in their degree of variation from that model. That, in a sense, defines the educational reform problem. The second list, of an emerging alternative model, is of a different sort. It is tentative and preliminary, based as noted on a still-limited amount of research and reporting, using information which is often scanty and fugitive. It might best be thought of as a kind of Weberian "ideal type." There are programs which include most if not all of those characteristics (*Escuela Nueva* in Colombia (Colbert and Arboleda, 1990; Schiefelbein, 1991; Siabato, 1997; McEwan, 1998) and its adaptations in Nicaragua and Guatemala, (Kraft, 1997) the Community Schools program in Egypt (Zaalouk, 1995; Hartwell, 1995; Farrell and Connelly, 1998), and some others in Africa and Asia (Farrell, 1999a; Farrell, 1999b) seem to have most of these characteristics, but not in any particular case all of them–e. g. *Escuela Nueva* does not use distance education modalities as a core part of its work, but some other programs do.) Moreover, the distinctions between the two "models" should not be seen as dichotomous "either/or" differences, but rather as continua of differences. Thus, some programs may have more or fewer of the characteristics of the "ideal type," in differing combinations. And on any given continuum programs may be differently placed toward one "side" or the other.

Figure 3 shows a first approximation at turning Figures 1 and 2 into a set of continua. We emphasize that this is preliminary and tentative. In contrasting Figure 1 and 2, it is for example clear that there are characteristics on each "list" which do not really have an "opposite pole" match. And as new cases are examined possible new categories of difference/similarity regularly emerge. Nontheless, by using this as a classificatory tool one can take descriptive reports about and research upon any given program and locate it simultaneously along all of these "lines of

difference" and by doing that across a large set of these programs begin to trace out patterns of difference and similarity.

At the same time we have come to realize that not all important "classifications" can be captured through this "traditional vs. emerging model" contrast. Within the set of emerging alternatives there are important distinctions which need to be analytically addressed, which do not necessarily have anything much to do with their degree and kind of difference from the traditional model. Thus we have been developing another analytical tool, which is a set of what we are currently calling "classification categories" for comparing these cases within the "emerging alternative" set. These are displayed in Figure 4. Again it must be emphasized that these are preliminary. There are many puzzles which remain to be solved as we look over a year's worth of work [1] poring over the material we have to hand about these cases and trying to develop useful categories in a "grounded theory" kind of fashion. Some of the "categories" uncovered/discovered are still so unformed that we don't quite know how to talk about them (e.g. some of the programs seem to be heavily dependent upon a powerful "ideology" or belief system among teachers and/or highly "charismatic" or "inspirational" or "ideational" leadership, but we haven't yet found a "language" for usefully distinguishing among cases on this "dimension"–if that is what it is–for a powerful example of this "factor" at work see Niyozov, 2001 and 2002). Some of the classifications reported in Figure 4 are really continua (e.g. Level and type of community involvement). Others are more discrete categories (e.g. Scope A and B). Still others are categories among which a given program may fit within none, few or many (e.g. Methodology and Curriculum focus). Some are essentially "placeholders" for more detailed

analysis and classificatory work yet to be completed (e.g. Preservice and Inservice teacher formation).

As we have begun to try to locate the various programs within these two frameworks many difficult questions have been arising. We will next address our attention to some of those.

What should we best "call" or "label" these emerging programs? There is no standard terminology available. That means that at some fundamental level we (not just the "we" at OISE/UT but the broader academic community) do not necessarily really know what we are talking about when we try to discuss these sorts of programs. One of our own objectives is to provide a solution to this conceptual problem. Many of these programs are locally or regionally labeled as "community schools." Others in other places are labeled as "non formal education." Still others are simply labeled as "alternative schools." And these terms are often used interchangeably in various documents for the same program(s). We have opted for now at least for the term "alternative" as it seem the most generic. Whatever else they are these cases are all very "different from" or "alternative to" the traditional model. We can then use an emerging version of Figure 3 to assess the kind, style and degree of "alternativity" from the traditional "forms of formal schooling" but without assuming or trying to create any sort of standardized measuring stick. Figure 3 is not presented as a tool for standardized measuring; it is a tool for thinking about and comparatively analyzing these cases. Related to this general question are two other questions.

Is the classical distinction beween "formal" and "non formal" education even useful these

days? This terminology derives from the 1960s and 1970s, from UNESCO and the work of Philip Coombs and associates. (Coombs, 1976; Coombs and Ahmed, 1974; Ahmed, 1975) It was very important at the time in denoting for us the fact that "education" could be and was being provided through means outside of and very different from the "forms of formal schooling." But our collective experience has moved along over these past decades. Typically the distinction has been denoted as: "formal" means "standard schooling" and "non-formal" means "out of schooling." In much of Africa in the official discourse "formal" refers to standard government-managed and government-financed schools, and "non-formal" refers to schools which are managed and/or financed by non-governmental organizations and/or local communities, even though these latter often have all or almost all of the "forms of formal schooling." . (ADEA, 2001, pp. 4-5) But also "non formal" is the label commonly used to refer to such "learning organizations" as Boy Scouts, Girl Guides, Youth Brigades, YM/YWCA's and other religion-sponsored organizations, and the like, to distinguish them from "formal schooling." And that was a very useful thing to do at that time, as it forcefully called to our attention the fact that such organizations and programs were often every bit as, often more, "educative" or "learning promoting" than were the standard formal schools. But what do we do with this terminological distinction when we discover, as we are, that many highly successful alternative programs are essentially bringing inside the walls of the "formal" school the "pedagogical methods" long associated with "non-formal education?" When the senior author of this paper, who spent close to forty years of his life working voluntarily as a Scout Troop Leader in several different nations, as well as a formal educator and scholar, first entered an *Escuela Nueva* in a small village in rural Colombia one of his first thoughts was: "My God, they are doing Scouting in a formal school!"

At the same time other often relatively large and old programs among this set areself-labeled as a "non-formal primary education" programs, but are from all accounts much more "formal" than is, say, *Escuela Nueva,* while much less "formal" than standard traditional primary schools in their own nations. Yet on the other hand, teachers in *Escuela Nueva,* and some others of these programs, while acting generally as learning facilitators rather than didacts or "frontal" teachers, also devote much of their time and effort to quite formally "teaching" new students how to read (using techniques which would be generally familiar to anyone who has spent much time in early primary classes of the most traditional sort—though with smaller groups of kids rather than a whole class) so as to enable them to later pursue the individually-paced self-guided learning program. Our sense from this is that the "formal" vs. "non'formal" distinction has served its purpose but we now need to move beyond it, beyond dichotomous thinking, to something like what is portrayed in Figure 3.

What do we actually mean by "Community Schooling?" As we look across the cases there is enormous variation in the type and degree of real community involvement in what are called "community schools." In some places "community school" means simply a non-government school, which may or may not have any strong links to any local community but may be "run" by a church organization, a local, regional or international NGO; "community" effectively means "not government." On the other hand *Escuela Nueva* schools are frequently labeled as "community schools" but they are part of the official "formal" national schooling system (in Colombia they are the officially nationally authorized "form" for rural schooling) and they are financed/managed nationally or regionally as are all other "official" schools. In this and

similar cases local communities are intricately and intensively linked to "their" schools but not ordinarily financially to any heavy degree. Yet in other places all "community school" really means is that the school is entirely or mainly financed and supported by the local communities and/or the parents, while "officially" part of the "government school system." An additional complication is that we don't really know across cases what the term "community" signifies. Among relatively small rural settings, which many of these programs primarily serve, the notion of "community" is fairly clear; there are relatively clearly defined boundaries, people and their ancestors have lived in this place for a long time, and have developed ways of "living together" which are generally well understood and consistently practiced. However even at this level the anthropological literature indicates that these "communities" are often not nearly so "together" and "common" as we tend to imagine. (On this see especially Geertz, 1995) Decentralization or "localization" programs have often failed because they have assumed a degree of "commonality" among local communities which does not in fact exist. (Farrell, 1999a) The problem becomes even more complicated among programs which are located in urban or peri-urban areas–often shanty-towns on the margins of large cities or in urban-centre slums. In these cases what constitutes the "community?" In some such cases the "community" appears to be defined not by contiguous habitation but by shared religious affiliations (Anderson, 2002). Thus in Figure 4 the classification "Level and type of community involvement" includes seven distinct categories, which may be found empirically in many different combinations and degrees–and the list of categories is likely to expand. So, when we use the term "community school" what exactly is it that we imagine we are referring to?

A host of other questions arise as we attempt to classify and compare these cases. Some of these are discussed below.

What exactly is child-centred pedagogy and/or active learning? As we scan the literature on pedagogy we find an enormous variation in the meanings attached to these terms, and as we examine these cases we encounter an equally wide array of pedagogical practices which are called "child centred" or "active." In some cases careful examination reveals that these terms mean little or nothing more than an increase in teacher-directed pair-work among students or an increase in individual rather than group responses to teacher questions and prompts. (Farrell, 2002) At the other extreme we find models and programs where there really is very active student involvement in and control of their own learning, and where teachers have really changed from controllers/directors of student learning to facilitators of such learning, and where the amount of vibrant (and often rather noisy–but productively rather than disruptively noisy) student activity is almost overwhelming but seemingly highly conducive to learning. And we find empirically just about everything in-between. Where exactly, and how, might we locate these three different cases, schools in rural Tajikistan, the Shepherd Schools in Ghana, and BRAC's schools, as well as the three Latin American cases presented last year, along the continua between child-centred–teacher-centred and active–passive? It is a deeply complex question, but essential if we are to have any hope of drawing comparative understanding from these many cases.

What constitutes "success" and how do we know? Most of these programs deal with young people who are generally thought to be the "hardest to reach and hardest to teach;" severely

marginalized children. In many cases they operate in "national" systems in which there are primary school leaving examinations which, if passed, provide primary school leaving certificates, which are keys which unlock many doors for educational and societal advancement if one "passes" them. They are in their contexts very "high stakes" indeed. In those cases, in most instances, the children who pass through these alternative programs do at least as well as, if not better than, children who have "gone through" the traditional systems. Given the conditions from which these children come and the stakes involved this can be considered a major triumph, truly succeeding against all odds. In economic terms this is a "value added" accomplishment of high degree. But many of those high stakes tests are themselves very faulty on many levels, both in terms of content and in technical measurement terms. If these young people finally do as well as or even better than kids from traditional schools on measurement instruments which are narrow and technically flawed, should we think of this as "success?" At one level yes, because however bad the measuring instruments are, "passing" them provides a key to life chances which would otherwise not be available.

A curious phenomenon here is that there is a vast literature on the "backwash effect" of traditional standardized testing of rather narrowly defined curricular goals in washing out alternative forms of teaching and narrowing schooling down to "teaching how to take tests." Yet in some of these alternative programs the children do well on these very faulty traditional forms of "testing" without any "backwash effect" on the alternative pedagogical forms. How is this happening? At the same time many of these cases set curricular goals for themselves which go well beyond what the "standard tests" test, or could test. The classification "Curriculum focus" in Figure 4

captures many of these, and categories 2 and 3 under the classification "Curriculum match with centralized (national/regional) standards" do the same. How do we "assess" learning in such areas as "civic education" or "environmental education" or "education for social justice?" Standardized tests surely won't do the job. But a few detailed research projects on some of these cases indicate that much of this sort of learning is taking place in at least some of these programs. (Pitt, 2001; Faucher, 2001; O'Sullivan, 2001)

Perhaps testing, while important for certification and legitimation reasons, is the wrong way to even think about this. A common theme among observers of these cases is that "success" is seen immediately through what Farrell calls the "eyeball test." One sees "fire in their eyes" and excitement about what they are learning in their facial expressions and body language. "Testing" and "research" can verify and legitimize, but all one really has to do, if one has any experience at all in "traditional schools" is watch the kids . The power of the learning is evident. This has been captured well in a recent report from a study visit of a group of African Ministers of Education and other participants from that region to cases on "our list" in India, Bangladesh, Guatemala and El Salvador. (ADEA, 2001. p. 10)

> "---We saw with our very eyes relaxed and expressive children happily learning and taking initiative in the management of their school
>
> ---we saw self-learning
>
> ---we saw flexible education programs
>
> ---we saw trainees directing their own teacher education programs
>
> ---we saw teachers become facilitators and guides

---we saw inspectors turned advisors

---we saw management in the hands of communities

---we saw illiterate parents involved in managing schools

---we saw it all happen with our own eyes".

The schools and children these ministers of education and their colleagues "saw" clearly passed the "eyeball" test. Whatever the "technicist measurement" gurus might say this constitutes powerful evidence of "success" even if it cannot pass tests of "statistical significance."

The paragraphs above are simply illustrative of some of the conceptual problems which arise as we try to seriously and carefully construct a set of analytic frameworks which will allow us to compare and learn from these programs. We could ask, and are asking ourselves, similar questions with reference to literally every term and category found in Figures 1 to 4, as we try to "fit" the various cases into these frameworks, and in the course of the exercise to further refine and define these frameworks and to understand these cases with such information as is available.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT? WHY IS IT MORE THAN A SET OF ACADEMIC PUZZLES?

1. However we "test" or "measure" or "assess" it, it seems clear that in many of these cases children who have been essentially "written off" by local and/or international "authorities" and agencies are learning well and powerfully within many of these alternative models of learning enablement. These cases are often enabling learning among children who have generally been

thought to be the hardest to reach and teach, and to accomplish curricular objectives which "traditional formal schools"seem generally incapable of reaching and teaching And in some of the cases they are able to accomplish this level of learning in several years less than in the "traditional schools." This case-specific and comparative knowledge represents a quite fundamental challenge to what has passed for standard pedagogical knowledge, theory and practice over the past decades in the richest nations, and the poorer places their "theories" have influenced. Pedagogically, how do these programs do as well as they do? That they manage to do it is clear. How exactly they manage to do it in so many very different situations is less clear. A major element of our research trajectory is to deal with that question. Simply arraying cases on the emerging set of categories and dimensions found in figures 1 to 4 is a first, but essential, step.

2. These programs also demonstrate that, contrary to a very popular belief around the world, teachers are not necessarily obstacles to fundamental school change. In these cases when such change happens the teachers are the promoters and agents of the change, even when they are working in very difficult situations, are not formally very well trained, and are very poorly paid, if at all. They, like the equally disadvantaged children in their charge, can accomplish remarkable feats of learning and change, in quite short time, under these alternative programs. In many of these cases traditionally-trained teachers (faculty of education programs and all of that) have with a few weeks of "in-service" formation and periodic small bursts of counseling and peer-mentoring, and frequently "teacher centre" work, been able to completely re-orient their ways of teaching and indeed understanding how and why they are teaching. In many others of the cases the teachers are selected from the local community, typically with a junior-secondary

"certificate," given a few weeks of "pre-service" formation, plus, as above, regular and steady in-service counseling and peer-mentoring, and with this are producing remarkable learning gains among the students in their charge. The documented teacher learning here seems very powerful because the new practices and understandings of how to "teach" and how learning can best happen are in almost all cases exactly (as in 180 degrees) opposed to what these teachers experienced as school-learners themselves and/or what they learned in traditional faculties of education. How exactly are these teachers, experienced and traditionally-trained, and/or new to the field and with lower than normally expected levels of "standard schooling," for certified teachers managing to learn so much so quickly and to develop and/or change their practice so fundamentally, and thus to produce such learning gains among such marginalized children? These mid-career or new-to-the-field teachers are adult learners. In the field of Adult Education there is much discussion of what is often labeled "perspective transformation," considered to be a most fundamental and difficult-to-achieve form of adult learning. Yet these teachers, generally from the most humble and difficult of backgrounds, are somehow becoming powerful agents of educational change: not obstacles to such change as teachers are frequently construed in the "standard literature" about educational reform, but rather "agents" or "promoters" of such change. This experience represents a fundamental challenge both for the field of Adult Education and for the fields of Teacher Development and Educational Reform as these have developed in the rich nations of the world and been transferred to almost everywhere else.

3. These successful change programs typically spread (or "go to scale") not by a centrally planned and commanded "reform plan" with goals and objectives and mechanisms set from afar,

and agents or supervisors from the national centre, or international agencies, or perhaps a regional university, going out to "teach" the teachers and local officials about the latest new educational scheme. Rather, they tend to spread by an innovation diffusion process –teachers learning from other teachers, sharing their "personal practical knowledge" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988) and skills with other teachers, and together exploring how their shared and growing knowledge and experience can help them all, together, experiment with ways to improve their ability to serve the children in their care. It should be noted however that administrative leadership does often play a critical role in these programs. The vast and relatively recent literature on school improvement or school effectiveness, mostly from and about "developed" nations, places much emphasis on the importance of school-based leadership. This does not generally apply directly to these cases as typically the schools are too small for the roles of "principal" or "headteacher" to have any real meaning. But there are people who carry out the pedagogical leadership function, who provide initial formation and in-service mentoring for teachers, who arrange regular meetings of teachers from neighboring schools to discuss problems and share ideas, who travel from school to school helping to solve problems and spreading innovative ideas and practices. They travel not with supervisory checklists but with ideas and suggestions. At more senior levels there are people who design and produce learning materials, secure and manage funds, and carry on all the other standard tasks of management and administration which a "system" requires. And at the "core" there is typically a single individual or a small team who provide "ideational" and "inspirational" leadership. The important difference from the traditional model is that in these emerging cases leadership and management are carried out in a fashion and spirit which enable and provide space for teacher learning and teacher-driven change, rather than attempting to control and regulate

teaching; which encourage and develop teachers' capacity to be creators of their own knowledge rather than simply consumers and deliverers of somebody else's knowledge, and thus enable teachers to be agents of change. But how has this actually ocurred/is ocurring in each individual case, given especially the long and sad history of failed attempts at large scale educational reform ? (Farrell, 2000) In a general history of "reform failure" how have many of these cases managed to do so well? Detailed "contemporary history" analyses on this issue are desperately needed if we are to avoid endlessly repeating the errors of the past.

Creating "answers to" or at the very least better understanding of, any of these basic questions, and more which are constantly emerging, about student learning, teacher learning and systemic learning and change is the core of the long term research program with which we are engaged.

FIGURE 1

THE TRADITIONAL "FORMS OF FORMAL SCHOOLING"

- One hundred to several hundred children/youth assembled (often compulsorily for at least a period of time) in a building called a school
- from approximately the age of 6 or 7 up to somewhere between age 11 to 16
- for 3 to 6 hours per day, where
- they are divided into groups of 20 to 60
- to work with a single adult (a "certified" teacher) in a single room
- for (especially at the "upper grades") discrete periods of 40 to 60 minutes, each devoted to a separate "subject"
- to be "studied" and "learned" in a group of young people of roughly the same age
- with supporting learning materials, e.g. books, chalkboards, notebooks, workbooks and worksheets (and in technical areas such things as loboratories, workbenches, practice sites, etc.) all of which is organized by
- a standard curriculum, set by an authority level much above the individual school, normally the central or provincial/state government, which all are expected to "cover" in an "age-graded" fashion.
- "Adult," assumed to be more knowledgable, 'teach" and students "receive instructionk"

from them

- in a broader system in which the "students" are expected/required to "repeat back" to the "adults" what they have been taught if they are to go any "higher" in the system.
- Teachers and/or a central exam system(s) evaluate students' ability to repeat back to th em what the students have been "taught," and provide formal recognized certificates for "passing" particular "grades" or "levels."
- Most or all of the financial support comes from national or regional governments, or other kinds of authority centres (e.g. religion-related schools) well above the local community level.

FIGURE 2

SOME COMMON FEATURES OF ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF SCHOOLING

- Child-centred rather than teacher-driven pedagogy
- Active rather than passive learning
- Multi-graded classrooms with continuous progress learning
- Combinations of fully trained teachers partially trained teachers a nd community resource people–parents and other community members are heavily involved in the learning of the children, and in the management of the school
- Peer-tutoring–older and/or faster-learning children assist and "teach" younger and/or slower learning children
- Carefully developed self-guided learning materials, which children, alone or in small groups can work through themselves, at their own pace, with help from other students and the teacher(s) as necessary–the children are responsible for their own learning
- Teacher and student-constructed learning materials
- Active student involvement in the governance and management of the school
- Use of radio, correspondence lesson materials, in some cases television, in a few cases computers
- On-going and regular in-service training and peer mentoring for teachers

- On-going monitoring/evaluation/feedback systems allowing the "system" to learn from its own experience, with constant modification of/experimentation with the methodology
- Free flows of children and adults between the school and the community
- Community involvement includes attention to the nutrition and health needs of young children long before they reach school age
- Locally adapted changes in the cycle of the school day or the school year
- The focus of the school is much less on "teaching" and much more on "learning."

FIGURE 3

FROM DICHOTOMIES TO CONTINUA: A PRELIMINARY ASSAY

The Traditional Forms of Schooling	**The Emerging Model**
Teacher centred pedagogy	Child centred pedagogy
Passive learning	Active learning
Age-graded	Multi-graded
Certified teachers the actual or desired norm	Combinations of fully trained and partially trained teachers and para-teachers
Teachers usually trained in faculties of education over a period of several months or years	Teachers usually trained through short courses of a few weeks duration
In-service training sporadic and centrally controlled	In-service training regular, frequent with peer-mentoring and local-needs centred
Teacher only/primary source of knowledge	Peer tutoring among students
Standard textbooks (if any)	Self-guided/specially designed learning materials
In-step group learning	Individually paced learning
Grade-to-grade promotion	Continuous progress
School relatively isolated from community	Heavy community involvement

School day/year cycle<----------->Local adaptations to
centrally set to day/year cycle

School day divided<----------->Time flows freely
into pre-set "periods"

"Periods" are devoted to<----------->Divisions among
separated "subjects" "subjects" very loose

Adults teach "frontally"<----------->Adults facilitate
student learning

Students receive instruction<----------->Students responsible
for own learning

FIGURE 4

PRELIMINARY CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Nature of Program

1. Addition to traditional school
2. Changed methodology within traditional school
3. Completely different school model

Methodology

1. Multi-grade classrooms
2. Active participatory lerning
3. Peer tutoring
4. Experiential learning
5. Teacher/student constructed learning materials
6. Self-learning modules/self-guided learning materials
7. Teacher as facilitator rather than didact

Curriculum focus

1. Language of instruction (program for linguistic minorities)
2. Community service
3. Civic education
4. Environmental education
5. Education for social justice
6. Community economic development
7. Individual/family income generation
8. Health promotion/nutrition
9. Ethics/religion

Curriculum match with centralized (national/regional) standards

1. Conforms with national/regional curriculum standards
2. As above but adds curricular elements
3. Differs significantly from national/regional curriculum standards

Locus of administration/control

1. Centralized regionally or nationally
2. Decentralized
3. Deconcentrated

Level and type of community involvement

1. Parents/community contribute to school finance–some to all
2. Parents/community contribute to school facility development/maintenance
3. Parents/community actively involved in school governance
4. Parents/community members involved in teaching/learning in the school
5. Teachers selected from/by the local community
6. Community members teach local skills/trades
7. Students work in the community/work-sites as learning environments

Pre-service teacher formation

1. Length
2. Duration
3. Pre-qualification
4. Source/location

In-service teacher formation

1. Frequency and duration
2. Source–local or regional/national
3. Responsiveness to expressed teacher needs/demands
4. Provision for peer mentoring
5. Provision for "teacher centre" exchanges among teachers

Scope: A

1. Nation-wide
2. Large region
3. Small region
4. Targeted group

Scope: B

1. Rural
2. Urban

   Spreading from one to the other
3. Both of the above

Gender focus

1. Girls
2. Boys

Exclusive or preferential

3. Both of the above

Source(s) of funding

1. Government
   - National
   - Regional
2. Community/parents
3. NGO(s)
   - Local
   - National
   - International
4. Bi-lateral funding agency(ies)
5. Multi-lateral funding agency(ies)

Primary objective/focus

1. Access to/participation in school
2. Survival through and completion of primary cycle
3. Improved student learning

ENDNOTE

1. The two main student contributors to this past years' work leading to this paper are Obed Mfum-Mensah and Sarah Haines. Mr. Mfum-Mensah is a co-author of this paper. For personal reasons Ms. Haines had to change from full-time to part-time status as a graduate student and is no longer associated with this project. Nontheless her early contribution to the work should be noted. (Mfum-Mensah et. al. 2001) This work in turn built upon work done the previous year in assembling basic information about these cases and developing abstracts regarding them by Anna Kochan (Kochan, 2000)

REFERENCES

ADEA (Association for the Development of Education in Africa) 2001 Newsletter 13 (4). October-December.

Ahmed, M. 1975. The Economics of Nonformal Education; Resources, Costs and Benefits. (New York: Praeger)

Anderson, S. (Ed.) 2002. Improving Schools Through Teacher Development: Case Studies of

the Aga Khan Foundation Projects in East Africa. (Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger) In press.

Colbert, V. and Arboleda, J. 1990 Universalization of Primary Education in Colombia: The New School Program. Paper presented at the World Conference on Education for All. Jomtien, Thailand

Coombs, P. 1976 "Nonformal Education: Myths, Realities and Opportunities," Comparative Education Review. 20: 281-93

Coombs, P. and Ahmed, M. 1974 Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal Education Can Help (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press)

Connelly, F. M. and Clandinin, J. 1988 Teachers as Curriculum Planners: Narratives of Experience (New York: Teachers College Press)

Farrell, J. P. 1999a Improving Learning: Perspectives for Primary Education in Rural Africa. Background paper prepared for the World Bank and UNESCO

Farrell, J. P. 1999b Improving Educational Quality in Pakistan and Nepal: Local and International Perspectives Background paper prepared for the World Bank.

Farrell, J. P. 2001 Transforming the Forms of Primary Education in the Developing World: the

Emergence of a Radically Alternative Model of Schooling Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society. Washington, D. C.

Farrell, J. P. 2002 "The AKF Experience Compared to Emerging Alternatives to Formal Schooling" in S. Anderson, (ed) Improving Schools Through Teacher Development: Case Studies of the Aga Khan Foundation Projects in East Africa (Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger) In press.

Farrell, J. P. and Connelly, F. M. 1998 Final Retrospective Report: Forum Workshops on Educational Reform in Egypt Final Report to UNICEF-Egypt and the Ministry of Education, Egypt.

Faucher, I. 2001 Civic and Environmental Learning in Plan International Community Schools in Rural Ecuador. Unpublished B.A. Thesis. International Development Studies Program. University of Toronto.

Geertz, C. 1995 After the Fact: Four Decades, Two Nations, One Anthropologist.(Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Haiplik, B. 2002 BRAC's NFPE Program: Focus on Teacher Development Issues Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society. Orlando, Florida.

Hartwell, A. 1995 A Review of Egypt's Community Schools Project (Cairo: UNICEF)

Kochan, A. 2000 Community Projects Database: An International List of Community Projects (Toronto: Comparative, International and Development Education Centre. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto.

Kraft, R. J. 1997 Rural Educational Reform in the Nueva Escuela Unitaria of Guatemala (Washington, D. C.: Academy for Educational Development)

McEwan, P. 1998 "The Effectiveness of Multigrade Schools in Colombia" International Journal of Educational Development 18 (6): 435-52

Mfum-Mensah, O. 2002. Voices of the Dispossessed: Students' Views of the Shepherd School Program in Northern Ghana Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Orlando, Florida

Mfum-Mensah, O. et. al. 2001 Community-Based Education Projects. An International List of Community Projects: Taxonomy of Community-based Educational Projects (Toronto: Comparative, International and Development Education Centre. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto)

Miwa, C. 2001 Chile's P-900 Program: Comparisons of Successful and Less Successful

Participating Schools Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society. Washington, D. C.

Niyozov, S. 2001 Understanding Teaching in Post-Soviet, Rural and Mountainous Tajikistan: Case Studies of Teachers' Life and Work Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto

Niyizov, S. 2002 Gobalization's Effects on Teaching in Tajikistan Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, Orlando, Florida.

O'Sullivan, M. 2001 From Santiago Atitlan to the Pan Maya Movement: National Educational Reform, Local Power and Social Change in Guatemala Unpublished doctoral thesis. (Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto)

Pitt, J. 2001 Civic Education and Citizenship in Escuela Nueva Schools in Colombia Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society. Washington, D. C.)

Reimers, F. 2000 (ed.) Unequal Schools, Unequal Chances: The Challenges to Equal Opportunity in the Americas (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

Schiefelbein, E. 1991 In Search of the School of the 21st Century: Is Colombia's Escuela Nueva

the Right Pathfinder? (Santiago, Chile: UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Latin America and the Caribbean)

Siabato, R. C. 1997 Educacion Basica Primaria en Zonas Rurales: La Escuela Nueva y su Relacion con la Evaluacion del Plan de Universalizacion de la Educacion Basica Primaria (Bogota: Ministerio de Educacion Nacional)

Zaalouk, M. 1995 The Children of the Nile: The Community Schools Project in Upper Egypt. (Paris: UNICEF)

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I. Document Identification:

Title: A PRELIMINARY ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

Author: JOSEPH P. FARRELL

Corporate Source: ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION / UNIV. OF TORONTO

Publication Date: MARCH, 2002

II. Reproduction Release:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please check one of the following three options and sign the release form.

__✓__ Level 1 - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

____ Level 2A - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

____ Level 2B - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no option is marked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign Here: "I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Joseph P. Farrell
Position: PROFESSOR
Printed Name: JOSEPH P. FARRELL
Organization: OISE/UT / UNIV. OF TORONTO
Address: OISE/UT.
CIDE/CTL
252 BLOOR ST. WEST
TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5S 1V6
Telephone No: (416) 923-6641 x2361
Date: Oct. 16, 2002

III. Document Availability Information (from Non-ERIC Source):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the

document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price per copy: Quantity price:

IV. Referral of ERIC to Copyright/Reproduction Rights Holder:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please complete the following:

Name:

Address:

V. Attach this form to the document being submitted and send both to:

Velma Mitchell, Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
P.O. Box 1348
1031 Quarrier Street
Charleston, WV 25325-1348

Phone and electronic mail numbers:

800-624-9120 (Clearinghouse toll-free number)
304-347-0467 (Clearinghouse FAX number)
mitchelv@ael.org